

Mr. Speaker, I also rise tonight to salute the many women who have survived this terrible disease—and there are many survivors. We know the grim statistics: in the last 20 years, the incidence of breast cancer has increased by 20 percent. Twenty years ago, 1 in 20 women developed breast cancer. Today, it is 1 in 8. Most Americans have known someone—a mother, sister, friend or coworker affected by this terrible tragedy.

Breast cancer is an extremely complex disease and we are unfortunately far from a cure. We have many more questions about breast cancer than answers. Solving the mystery of breast cancer is like working on an incredibly complicated and frustrating puzzle. Each piece of this puzzle solved is a small victory. The Federal Government's research is helping us to solve this puzzle and to slowly answer these unanswered questions.

One of these unanswered questions is the role the environment plays in breast cancer. Another is the importance of genetics in determining who develops the disease and who does not. Still another question is whether diet can reduce a women's risk of breast cancer.

There is mounting evidence that exposure to pesticides may contribute to breast cancer. For example, a study done several years ago at Mt. Sinai Medical Center in New York found that women with the highest levels of a pesticide compound in their blood were four times more likely to have breast cancer than other women. Another study in Israel found a 10-percent drop in breast cancer during the same time that there was a drop in the levels of pesticides in human and cow milk. The Long Island breast cancer study will help to answer many other important questions regarding the link between environmental and occupational factors in breast cancer. But again, many unanswered questions remain.

Science has also recently begun to document a genetic link to breast cancer. The breast cancer gene is thought to account for 5 percent of all breast cancer cases but 25 percent of the breast cancer in women under age 30.

Last month, researchers found a particular mutation of this breast cancer gene in 1 percent of a study of Jewish women of Eastern European background. Jewish women with a family history of breast cancer who were found to have this gene had a very high risk of developing breast cancer. However, we don't know what kind of risk women face who have this gene but do not have a family history of breast cancer. So it makes no sense to test women for this gene until we know more. Again, many unanswered questions remain.

Lastly, scientists are beginning to develop a link between nutrition and breast cancer. But again, our knowledge is scanty. We know that the risk of breast cancer increases with the degree of obesity. One small study

showed that moderate alcohol use might even increase a woman's risk of cancer because of the influence of alcohol on hormones. Research continues to tell us that a low-fat, high-fiber diet may decrease our risk of many cancers including breast cancer. Exercise may also reduce the risk of the disease. But again, many unanswered questions remain.

Breast cancer poses one of the major scientific challenges of today. I urge my colleagues to look at the many unanswered questions as a challenge to continue to maintain the Federal Government's commitment to breast cancer research and the enforcement of environmental regulations. We must not abandon our commitment to the women of America.

But funding research is not enough. We must support efforts to regulate exposures to chemicals strongly suspected of being linked to breast cancer. Tomorrow we will vote on a motion by Representative STOKES to allow the EPA to enforce the Delaney clause. The Delaney clause protects processed foods from contamination by known carcinogens but Congress has voted to restrict EPA from enforcing the Delaney clause. Congress has also tied EPA's hands by cutting its budget by one-third. This is an outrage. Members have a chance tomorrow to support the Stokes motion to demonstrate that they are truly serious about addressing the breast cancer epidemic.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KING] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. KING addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. MINGE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAZIO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. LAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. SLAUGHTER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. BARR addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. FARR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. FARR addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Ms. MCKINNEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. MCKINNEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. GUTKNECHT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. SCARBOROUGH addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mrs. MYRICK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. MYRICK addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

AMERICAN POLICY IN BALKANS A FAILURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, we have witnessed 3 years of failure as far as the policy of the United States concerning the ongoing tragedy in the Balkans. During this 3 years, we have heard the screams of agony and horror. And what has American policy been? An arms embargo against the criminals who are committing the aggression and the victims alike.

This formula of treating the victims and the criminal alike had left the aggressor with all of the tanks, all of the heavy artillery, and an overwhelming superiority in arms. It led to 100,000 deaths or more. The aggressor was, naturally, not deterred by an arms embargo that prevented the victims from arming themselves and defending themselves against aggression.